

Black, "do you recall having seen Roland Molineux?"

"I do," said the professor.

Q. Describe the circumstances. A. In answer to an invitation I had sent him he came to the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Fifty-ninth street. I was there from 8.30 to 12 o'clock. Molineux came in shortly before 10 o'clock. With him then I left the college and went up to the university—the new buildings. On the way up we had lunch in a restaurant on Broadway. We met Dr. Chandler in University Hall and had about five minutes' conversation with him.

Q. When we went among the buildings, visited the laboratories, went to the top floor of the architectural building and later into the engineering building. After that we visited the gymnasium. In the library building we looked around awhile, and then I parted from Molineux on the steps of the library building. He went toward Amsterdam avenue.

Q. What time was that? A. It was 4.15. It was shortly after sunset, and I had to catch a train on the Harlem road at 5.15, and I had only enough time to make it.

Q. Where is the college? A. At One Hundred and Sixteenth street and One Hundred and Twentieth street, Amsterdam avenue and the Boulevard. The best way downtown is by the Sixth Avenue elevated.

Q. Where is the nearest station to the post-office on that road? A. At Park place.

Together All Afternoon.

Q. You were with the defendant, then, from shortly before 12 o'clock on Dec. 23 till a quarter of 5 o'clock. A. Without a break, I was with him all that time.

Q. How do you fix the date? A. It was the last Friday before the holidays.

This finished the examination of the witness by the defense, and Mr. Osborne began his cross-examination.

Q. How do you fix the date? Q. Because it was the last Friday before Christmas.

Mr. Black then asked:

Q. Were you and Molineux continuously together from 11 A. M. to 4.45? A. Yes.

Q. Henry C. Lookwood, the post-office clerk, called for the prosecution to tell where the poison package was mailed, was recalled by ex-Gov. Black and asked to fix the time of mailing. He could not fix it exactly. He said it was mailed in the Broadway side of the Post-Office. That was in corroboration of the testimony of Mrs. Stephenson.

CONTRADICTS STORY OF YOUNG ERHARD.

Harry E. Powell, a clerk in Hartigan & Co's jewelry store in Newark, where the fatal bottle-holder was sold, was called by the defense.

Q. Did you know a boy of the name of Eugene Erhard employed there, and did he wrap packages? A. No. The boy who wrapped up packages on Dec. 21, 1898, was Danny Yetta.

This boy is known only as "Danny" heretofore, and who Miss Miller said had wrapped up the bottle-holder. Erhard said he wrapped up the bottle-holder and fixed the time early in the afternoon.

Mr. Osborne cross-examined the witness.

Q. You were in the store on Dec. 21, 1898? A. Yes.

Q. And you can fix the price of this bottle-holder? A. No, I can't do it, \$5.00, I think.

Witness said then that Detective Carey had come to him after the murder and that he had answered all questions. Mr. Weeks had a talk with Mr. Hartdegen, and then he, the witness, talked over all the circumstances of the sale with Detective Carey.

FOUND IT EASY TO BUY CYANIDE.

William H. Lyons, who is connected with the law firm of Olcott, Weeks & Battle, was the next witness called. He bought cyanide of mercury at No. 1360 Broadway. It was the first store he entered. At a second store the clerk told him he had none of the chemical in stock. No difficulty was experienced in buying the cyanide on his first trip. He gave a fictitious name and address.

John W. Bacon, another man from the lawyers' office, bought cyanide of mercury this morning at No. 117 Broadway.

No questions were asked him.

William M. Olcott, of counsel, was called and ex-Gov. Black asked him if he had ever bought cyanide of mercury.

"I went last Thursday, a week ago, into a drug store at Columbus avenue and Eightieth street," said Mr. Olcott.

"It is a new store. I asked for one ounce of cyanide of mercury, together with some black oxide of manganese and chloride of potash. The three cost 50 cents. The clerk gave me the chemicals and then asked me what I wanted to do with them. I said they were to be used for photographic purposes. He then said he would have to ask my name, as the law required that. I told him, as any person might if he wished to conceal the transaction, that my name was J. G. Smith, of No. 51 West Eighty-second street. Both the name and the address were of course fictitious."

John Saunders, a member of the office staff of Weeks & Battle, testified that Oct. 9 he went to No. 133 Broadway and bought under Mr. Weeks' direction an ounce of cyanide of mercury. He had to sign a fictitious name in the book.

Mr. Osborne was anxious to find out if these thoughts the clerk could identify him. Witness could not tell.

When some of the packages of cyanide of mercury had been passed among the jurors, Mr. Osborne cross-examined this witness.

Q. Where did you first go for this cyanide? A. To the Broadway Drug Company.

Q. Did you get any there? A. I was told there was none in stock, but would get it for me. I could explain what I wanted it for. I told them it was for photographic experiments, and gave my name and address. I did not go back for the chemicals, but got it from the place at 171 Broadway.

The witness talked in a voice so low that the jurors could scarcely hear him.

"Talk up, Mr. Bacon," ex-Gov. Black admonished. "We have had so many unhelpful witnesses that it seems to me a lawyer should talk up."

ERRY CONTRADICTS LETTER-BOX MAN.

Harry C. Terry, a reporter known as a newspaper man as "The Peacock," was called by the defense.

Q. You were in the Post-Office on Dec. 21, 1898, in Sullivan's office in Park place, testified that he left Cornish in the office at 5 o'clock. Cornish, witness said, did not wear an overcoat.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

he had been in his present employment. "Five years," said the witness.

Q. In what capacity? A. As an humble reporter.

Q. Did you ever meet Joseph J. Koch (the letter-box man)? A. Yes; in January, 1898.

Q. That was about the time of the inquiry? A. Yes; Koch said to me after seeing Molineux in court for several days. "He is not the man who hired the letter-box and I'll not stand for it any more than I would stand for Gallagher. I never saw Molineux."

Q. Did you afterward see Koch? A. Yes; after the coroner's inquest—two days after. Koch was in court all that time to identify Molineux.

Q. Did you have a talk with him prior to the trial? A. Yes. He offered to give me a story that Molineux was the man who hired the letter-box, for \$1,000.

The question was objected to, but the witness's answer was allowed to stand. Mr. Osborne cross-examined Mr. Terry.

Q. Koch did not say he could identify Molineux as the man who hired the letter-box? A. We did not let him get that far.

Q. Do you know Zeller? A. Yes. You have seen him in the Newark factory. A. Yes.

Q. Did you try to talk to him about this case? A. Yes.

Mr. Black objected, and the objection was sustained.

Mr. Black asked if the witness had shown Koch a photograph of Molineux. "Yes," he answered.

Q. Did he say to you he recognized him as the man who rented a letter box? A. Yes.

Q. And then at the coroner's inquest he said he had never seen Molineux? A. That was what he said.

George A. Abbott, another lawyer associated with the defense, was called to tell the number of letters Cornish, Barnett and Molineux that he had examined and tabulated as exhibits. "He had also included the poison package. He only selected comparatively few specimens for comparison out of thousands of exhibits."

Mr. Black introduced in evidence the date of Mrs. Rogers' decree of divorce to show that she could not have married Cornish if she had wanted to. He also introduced Mrs. Rogers' testimony at the last trial in which she said "the fatal bottle-holder did not match the silverware in my dresser. I had that silverware for several years."

Then the defense rested for the present. It was 11.40 o'clock A. M.

STATE IN REBUTTAL BRINGS ON FARRELL.

Mr. Osborne at once began putting in his evidence in rebuttal. His first witness was Joseph Farrell, the Newark detective, who failed to appear while the State was bringing out its testimony in chief. It was alleged at the time that Farrell was being kept out of the State by the defense. He and Molineux were friends. Farrell met Molineux near Hartdegen's store on Dec. 21, the day the bottle-holder was purchased.

Q. How long have you known Roland Molineux? A. Since 1898.

Farrell Saw Prisoner.

Q. Did you see him on Dec. 21, 1898? A. I did.

Q. Where did you see him? A. On Market street, in Newark, between 2.30 and 3 o'clock.

Q. Did you talk with him that day on the street? A. Yes.

Q. Did you see him at any time after that? A. Yes, at the factory in the first week in January, 1899.

Q. What did you say to him? A. I told him I had heard he was accused of the Adams poisoning.

Q. Did he tell you why he was on Market street that day? He did not, but I told him he was going back from lunch.

Q. Was that the direct way for him to go to his factory? A. It was one way. There were three or four ways for him to go. The Market street station was about three-quarters of a mile from the factory.

On cross-examination Mr. Black asked the witness if one could pass Hartdegen's jewelry store in going the natural way from the factory to the station. Farrell said he would not have to pass the store.

Q. Would the shortest way from the factory to the depot be past Hartdegen's store? A. No.

Took Longest Way.

Q. Would not that really be a long way around? A. It would be about seven blocks, while another would be only four.

Lawyer Weeks, who is more familiar with Newark streets than Gov. Black, took the witness in hand and asked many questions.

Justice Lambert interrupted.

"It is this great turning point in the case," he said.

"Perhaps it is," answered Mr. Weeks. "Well, I thought the judge was right. You have established that the past Hartdegen's store was the longest way from the factory to the depot. Now, more do you want? More questioning along that line will only confuse us."

Gov. Black thought the testimony was trivial, anyhow, and so the witness was excused.

PROVING AN ALIBI FOR HARRY CORNISH.

After Mr. Osborne had brought out some important points concerning Mrs. Rogers' divorce and had shown by G. H. Baker, post-office clerk in Newark, that the "Burns letter" which Molineux admitted writing to a drug firm had been mailed in Newark, the State began the work of establishing an alibi for Harry Cornish.

The first witness on that point was John Vocum. He testified that on Dec. 21, 1898, at the hour Mrs. Stephenson says she saw Cornish mail the poison package Cornish was with him in the office of "Jim" Sullivan, Secretary of the American Athletic Union, in Park place.

"I was with him that day till between 4 and 4.30 o'clock," said the witness.

Contradicts Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did he have an overcoat on? A. He did not.

Mrs. Stephenson swore the man she saw wore an overcoat.

On cross-examination ex-Gov. Black pinned the witness down on the subject of the overcoat.

Q. What makes you so sure he wore no overcoat? A. He hardly ever wore one.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

James S. Mitchell, a well-known amateur tennis thrower, who was also with Cornish on Dec. 21, 1898, in Sullivan's office in Park place, testified that he left Cornish in the office at 5 o'clock. Cornish, witness said, did not wear an overcoat.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

James S. Mitchell, a well-known amateur tennis thrower, who was also with Cornish on Dec. 21, 1898, in Sullivan's office in Park place, testified that he left Cornish in the office at 5 o'clock. Cornish, witness said, did not wear an overcoat.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

James S. Mitchell, a well-known amateur tennis thrower, who was also with Cornish on Dec. 21, 1898, in Sullivan's office in Park place, testified that he left Cornish in the office at 5 o'clock. Cornish, witness said, did not wear an overcoat.

MRS. DAN HANNA NO. 1, WHO SAYS SHE AND MR. AND MRS. HANNA NO. 2 ARE FRIENDS.



(From a Hitherto Unpublished Photograph by Marceau.)

on Dec. 23, 1898? A. I was.

Q. Tell what you did? A. I went with Mr. Vocum to lunch. Then we went to Mr. Sullivan's office, about 2.15 or 2.30 o'clock. I was there till after 5 o'clock, when I went with Nelson to Church street, where we got a drink.

Q. Did you talk with him that day on the street? A. Yes.

Q. Did you see him at any time after that? A. Yes, at the factory in the first week in January, 1899.

Q. What did you say to him? A. I told him I had heard he was accused of the Adams poisoning.

Q. Did he tell you why he was on Market street that day? He did not, but I told him he was going back from lunch.

Q. Was that the direct way for him to go to his factory? A. It was one way. There were three or four ways for him to go. The Market street station was about three-quarters of a mile from the factory.

On cross-examination Mr. Black asked the witness if one could pass Hartdegen's jewelry store in going the natural way from the factory to the station. Farrell said he would not have to pass the store.

Q. Would the shortest way from the factory to the depot be past Hartdegen's store? A. No.

Took Longest Way.

Q. Would not that really be a long way around? A. It would be about seven blocks, while another would be only four.

Lawyer Weeks, who is more familiar with Newark streets than Gov. Black, took the witness in hand and asked many questions.

Justice Lambert interrupted.

"It is this great turning point in the case," he said.

"Perhaps it is," answered Mr. Weeks. "Well, I thought the judge was right. You have established that the past Hartdegen's store was the longest way from the factory to the depot. Now, more do you want? More questioning along that line will only confuse us."

Gov. Black thought the testimony was trivial, anyhow, and so the witness was excused.

PROVING AN ALIBI FOR HARRY CORNISH.

After Mr. Osborne had brought out some important points concerning Mrs. Rogers' divorce and had shown by G. H. Baker, post-office clerk in Newark, that the "Burns letter" which Molineux admitted writing to a drug firm had been mailed in Newark, the State began the work of establishing an alibi for Harry Cornish.

The first witness on that point was John Vocum. He testified that on Dec. 21, 1898, at the hour Mrs. Stephenson says she saw Cornish mail the poison package Cornish was with him in the office of "Jim" Sullivan, Secretary of the American Athletic Union, in Park place.

"I was with him that day till between 4 and 4.30 o'clock," said the witness.

Contradicts Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did he have an overcoat on? A. He did not.

Mrs. Stephenson swore the man she saw wore an overcoat.

On cross-examination ex-Gov. Black pinned the witness down on the subject of the overcoat.

Q. What makes you so sure he wore no overcoat? A. He hardly ever wore one.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

James S. Mitchell, a well-known amateur tennis thrower, who was also with Cornish on Dec. 21, 1898, in Sullivan's office in Park place, testified that he left Cornish in the office at 5 o'clock. Cornish, witness said, did not wear an overcoat.

Q. How can you fix the date of that meeting with Cornish? A. I went to Middletown that day—the Friday before the holidays.

Q. Is there not an entrance to the Post-Office almost opposite Park place, where you were? A. I think there is one nearly opposite.

thing because Mrs. Stephenson took the stand yesterday and swore you had an overcoat on? A. I have not.

Q. 21 the other trial you said that you didn't get there at Sullivan's office until dark? A. I may not have been accurate.

Pinned Down on Coat Question.

Q. Didn't you say "I wore a brown overcoat on that day, the same one I got over there. Yes, it is a brown overcoat"? A. I don't think I did.

Mr. Black recognized the strong point he had made. He asked the question over and over again. Cornish was up and nervous.

"Mr. Black read again from the minutes of the last trial, both from the typewritten sheets and the printed record. Cornish testified then positively that he had a brown overcoat, the same he had worn for some time, and the very one he then indicated in the courtroom as his."

In response to the repeated question by Gov. Black, after the reading of this testimony, the witness persisted he had no brown overcoat, but that the one he wore over evening dress in the winter of 1898 was black.

On the Rack Again.

Ex-Gov. Black reached for the transcript of the testimony of the former trial. Then he went at Cornish.

"You don't testify that you had a brown overcoat—that you had worn for some time?"

The jurors leaned forward eagerly and the court-room was very still while Cornish pulled his mustache and hesitated.

"I don't think I testified to this," he said at last, in a low voice.

Q. Didn't you swear "I don't know just what time it was. I saw the employees, Mr. Sullivan and perhaps Sam Nelson"? A. I didn't testify accurately perhaps.

Q. Then you think there is grave necessity this time to refresh your memory? A. I am yes, I said at the last trial that I left Sullivan's office when it was dark.

Q. Don't you think it's far out of the way between a brown overcoat and no overcoat? A. I do, of course.

Q. Haven't you come over the whole thing because Mrs. Stephenson took the stand yesterday and swore you had an overcoat on? A. I have not.

Q. 21 the other trial you said that you didn't get there at Sullivan's office until dark? A. I may not have been accurate.

Pinned Down on Coat Question.

Q. Didn't you say "I wore a brown overcoat on that day, the same one I got over there. Yes, it is a brown overcoat"? A. I don't think I did.

Mr. Black recognized the strong point he had made. He asked the question over and over again. Cornish was up and nervous.

"Mr. Black read again from the minutes of the last trial, both from the typewritten sheets and the printed record. Cornish testified then positively that he had a brown overcoat, the same he had worn for some time, and the very one he then indicated in the courtroom as his."

In response to the repeated question by Gov. Black, after the reading of this testimony, the witness persisted he had no brown overcoat, but that the one he wore over evening dress in the winter of 1898 was black.

On the Rack Again.

Ex-Gov. Black reached for the transcript of the testimony of the former trial. Then he went at Cornish.

"You don't testify that you had a brown overcoat—that you had worn for some time?"

The jurors leaned forward eagerly and the court-room was very still while Cornish pulled his mustache and hesitated.

"I don't think I testified to this," he said at last, in a low voice.

Q. Didn't you swear "I don't know just what time it was. I saw the employees, Mr. Sullivan and perhaps Sam Nelson"? A. I didn't testify accurately perhaps.

Q. Then you think there is grave necessity this time to refresh your memory? A. I am yes, I said at the last trial that I left Sullivan's office when it was dark.

Q. Don't you think it's far out of the way between a brown overcoat and no overcoat? A. I do, of course.

Q. Haven't you come over the whole thing because Mrs. Stephenson took the stand yesterday and swore you had an overcoat on? A. I have not.

The husband of Mrs. Stephenson was asked to stand up.

Q. Is that the man? A. Yes; that is the man.

Q. What else did you hear? A. She said to the gray-haired man that she could not be very sure she could positively identify Cornish.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

Q. Do you believe in dreams? A. Not much.

That was all for this witness. The prosecution rested its case.

When the prosecution had rested the defense recalled Mrs. Stephenson.

Q. Did your husband say to you yesterday, "There is Cornish"? A. No.

MRS. HANNA NO. 1 SAYS 'I LOVE NO. 2'

She Declares that Their Relations Are Not Only Friendly but Are of the Most Cordial Character.

HATCHET IS UNDER SOD.

Visit Each Other and Say Nice Things—Little Dan with Father and Mrs. Hanna No. 2 at Cleveland, and Came Here With Them.

The exclusive announcement in The Evening World yesterday that the former and present wife of Dan Hanna, of Cleveland, were friendly, was confirmed to-day by Mrs. May Harrington Hanna—Mrs. Hanna No. 1.

Dan Hanna and his wife left for their home in Cleveland last night.

Mrs. May Harrington Hanna was most gracious in receiving a reporter for The Evening World in her apartments at the Waldorf-Astoria to-day. She said she was glad to have an opportunity to set the public right concerning her position and the position of her former husband and his present wife.

Mr. Hanna returned to Cleveland, she said, because he